

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of July 21, 2009 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 14-1437.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §§ 102 & 103**

Claims 1, 4-7, and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,020,696 to Perry, et al. (hereinafter Perry). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry with reference to the Background section of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections and thus has not amended the claims to overcome the rejections.

### **Aspects of Applicants' Invention**

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by system services within an administrative interface.

The method can include categorizing the system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services; and establishing a plurality of system service profiles based on functional roles of users. Each system service profile represents a customized subset of the system services.

The method also can include detecting a request for the presentation of system services from a user; ascertaining an identity of the user and at least one functional role

associated with the user; determining at least one of the system service profiles corresponding to the at least one functional role of the user; determining at least one system service to be displayed in accordance with the at least one determined system service profile; and displaying the determined at least one system service within the administrative interface in a manner that the determined at least one system service is navigable based on the functional categories of the determined at least one system service, the at least one determined system service profile corresponding to the user, and computing devices providing the determined at least one system service.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0028] to [0034]; see also Figs. 2-4.

**The Claims Define Over The Prior Art**

In Perry each tab (such as a System tab, Modules tab, Ports tab, and SONET Interface tab) corresponds to a particular function of the network device. In contrast, in the present invention system services (not devices) are categorized into functional categories based on functions of the system services (not devices).

In Perry the System tab data as well as the Modules tab, Ports tab, and SONET Interface tab data all represent physical aspects of the network device. It is noted that in the present invention the functional categories are not based on physical aspects of a particular network device, but rather on functions of system services. The examples of functional categories according to the present invention can include printer, e-mail, storage, and the like (see, e.g., Fig. 4; see also Specification, paragraph [0033]: “The navigation selection 405, however, can include category navigation items based upon functional categories, such as printer, e-mail, storage, and the like.”).

It was asserted on page 7 of the Office Action that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., functional categories include printer, e-mail, storage, and the like) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

However, these are just some examples of functional categories and the present invention is not limited to these examples. It is noted that during patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification" and the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. See MPEP 2111. Applicant believes that those skilled in the art considering the specification would clearly understand that functional categories of system services according to the present invention are totally different from the tabs representing physical aspects of a network device according to Perry.

The status window 897 may include many tabs/folders for displaying various data about the network device configuration (see, e.g., Fig. 4f of Perry). However, it is not clear how the configuration data of a network device has anything to do with categorizing system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services as in the present invention.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Perry does not disclose categorizing system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 27-28 of the instant application.

Perry discloses that profiles may be used to provide individual users with customized graphical user interfaces. However, Perry does not disclose displaying the system services in a manner that the system services are navigable based on system service profiles corresponding to functional roles of users (see, for example, "Print Operator" and "Email Operator" in Fig. 3 and "Administrator" in Fig. 4 of instant application).

The selection of a tab in Perry provides the user with data corresponding to a particular network device (not system services) and selected tab. However, the tab, as discussed above, does not represent a category of system services. Therefore, Perry does not disclose displaying the system services in a manner that the system services are

navigable based on the functional categories of the system services (see, for example, “Printer,” “Email,” “Storage,” and “Misc” in Fig. 4 of instant application).

Further, Perry does not disclose displaying the system services in a manner that the system services are navigable based on computing devices providing the system services (see, for example, “Server 425,” “Server 430,” “Client 435,” and “Peripheral 440” in Fig. 4 of instant application). It is noted that in Perry the tabs correspond to one particular network device, not different computing devices providing the system services.

In addition, Perry clearly does not show an interface in which the system services are displayed in a manner that the system services are navigable based on the functional categories of the system services, the profiles corresponding to roles of users, **and** computing devices providing the system services. As can be seen in Figs. 3-4 and explained in Specification, paragraphs [0030]-[0034], in the present invention the system services can be displayed in a way that the system services can be navigated based on the functional categories of the system services (for example, “Printer,” “Email,” “Storage,” and “Misc” in Fig. 4), the system service profiles corresponding to the user (for example, “Print Operator” and “Email Operator” in Fig. 3 and “Administrator” in Fig. 4), **and** computing devices providing the system services (for example, “Server 425,” “Server 430,” “Client 435,” and “Peripheral 440” in Fig. 4).

Accordingly, Perry fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1 and 27-28. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 27-28 define over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 20, 2009

/Gregory A. Nelson/  
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577  
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150  
NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG LLP  
Customer No. 40987  
525 Okeechobee Boulevard, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Telephone: (561) 838-5229